

## REMARKS:

The Examiner repeated the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(e) as anticipated by Stoughton et al. ('352). The Examiner did not accept the applicant's claim to the benefit of the priority date of Ser. No. 08/569,358 (filed 12/8/95) as a reason for overcoming this intervening patent. In a telephone interview with the undersigned, the Examiner explained that the applicant should provide evidence of support in the specification and claims of the parent case for the claims in the present application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Section 120.

Accordingly, it is noted that Claim 1 of the present application is substantially the same as Claim 5 of the parent case. The only difference is the substitution of "protein" with --large molecule--. Since a protein is a large molecule, the original claim was unnecessarily restrictive; therefore, it was changed to cover the full scope of the disclosed invention. Otherwise, that claim is identical to the original claim. Additional support for Claim 1 is found in the example disclosed from page 31 to page 39 of the parent application, and in Fig. 19 thereof. The first paragraph of page 3 contains specific reference to other large molecules that can be analyzed with the method of the invention.

Claim 2 is the same as Claim 6 of the parent case. Support may be found on page 40, third paragraph, to page 47, second

paragraph, and in Fig. 22 of the parent case.

Claim 3 further defines the large molecule recited in Claim 1. Support for this claim may be found on page 3, first paragraph.

Claim 4 is the same as Claim 3 in the parent case. It further limits the large molecule of Claim 1. Support may be found on page 48, second paragraph.

Claim 5 further defines the large molecule recited in Claim 2. Support for this claim may be found on page 3, first paragraph.

Claim 6 is again the same as Claim 3 in the parent case. It further limits the large molecule of Claim 2. Support may be found on page 48, second paragraph.

Claim 7 is substantially the same as Claim 1 of the parent case. The only difference is again the substitution of "protein" with -large molecule-- in order to cover the full scope of the invention. Additional support for Claim 7 may be found on page 3, first paragraph; and on page 38, second paragraph, to page 39, second paragraph.

Claim 8 is again the same as Claim 6 of the parent case. Support may be found on page 44, second paragraph, to page 47, second paragraph, and in Fig. 22 of the parent case.

Claim 9 is the same as Claim 2 in the parent case. Support may be found on page 39, second paragraph.

Claim 10 was added to further define the large molecule recited in Claim 7. Support for this claim may be found on page 3, first paragraph.

Claim 11 is the same as Claim 3 in the parent case. Support may be found on page 48, second paragraph.

Claim 12 further defines the large molecule recited in Claim 8. Support may be found on page 3, first paragraph.

Claim 13, dependent from Claim 8, is again the same as Claim 3 in the parent case. Support may be found on page 48, second paragraph.

Claim 14 further defines the large molecule recited in Claim 9. Support may be found on page 3, first paragraph.

Claim 15, dependent from Claim 9, is the same as Claim 3 in the parent case. Support may be found on page 48, second paragraph.

Claim 16 is the same as Claim 4 in the parent case. Support may be found on page 46, third paragraph, to page 47, first paragraph.

Claim 17 further defines the large molecule recited in Claim 16. Support may be found on page 3, first paragraph.

Finally, Claim 18, dependent from Claim 16, is the same as Claim 3 in the parent case. Support may be found on page 48, second paragraph.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that all claims of the present application are fully supported by the specification and claims of the parent case. A declaration by the inventor is also enclosed to further support this clear position and the fact that the claimed subject matter, to the extent it overlaps matter disclosure by Stoughton et al., had already been invented by the applicant as early as 1995.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Stoughton et al. patent does not constitute prior art for the purpose of prosecution in this case. Because all claims stand rejected solely on the basis of the teachings of Stoughton et al., it is submitted that the claims, as currently pending, define patentable subject matter and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

The applicant and his attorney thank the Examiner for his courtesy during the referenced telephonic interview. If any issue remains that could be resolved over the phone, the

undersigned would appreciate the opportunity to do so.

Please charge any cost that may be associated with this transmittal to our Deposit Account No. 02-2451.

Respectfully submitted,



Antonio R. Durando  
Reg. No. 28,409

(520) 881-9442 phone  
(520) 881-9448 fax